

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **February 10, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-28** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-8, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo et al. (U.S. 6,321,266 B1) in view of Rothrock et al. (U.S. 5,408,470).

Claims 9-13, 18, 19, 21-23, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo et al. (U.S. 6,321,266 B1) in view of Harif (U.S. 2002/0087881 A1).

Claims 14, 20, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo et al. (U.S. 6,321,266 B1) in view of Harif (U.S. 2002/0087881 A1), and further in view of Herrendoerfer et al. (U.S. 6,472,759 B1).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo et al. (U.S. 6,321,266 B1) in view of Rothrock et al. (U.S. 5,408,470), and further in view of Herrendoerfer et al. (U.S. 6,473,759 B1).

The Present Amendment

Claims 1-8, 14, 18-27, and new claim 28 are presented for examination. Claims 9-13 and 15-17 have been canceled since their subject matter is covered by other claims. Claims 1, 14, 18, 23, and 28 are in independent form.

The present amendment has corrected all the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections listed on pages 2 and 3 in the Office Action.

With regard to claim 7 listed under item a-vii on page 3 of the Office Action, the term “executable file” is not the “result file”. Applicant believes claim 7 is not indefinite since the terms are clearly distinct.

With regard to claim 18 listed under item a-ix on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 18 is recited as a system claim comprising means plus function elements. This format is permitted by 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph, and is so commonly used and accepted that claim 18 cannot be indefinite on the grounds stated in the Office Action.

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites formatting a non-printing task where the non-printing task is not a task associated with being processed by a printing device and causing the printing device to execute the non-printing task.

Yokomizo teaches transmitting print jobs to printers and processing print jobs by printers. Indeed, a printer is designed to process print jobs. But, Yokomizo fails to teach or suggest formatting a non-printing task and causing a printing device to execute the non-printing task as recited in claim 1. Yokomizo only describes a system and process where a printer can be made to process different kinds of print jobs, but not non-printing tasks (see column 63, lines 51-53 “That is, a printer can be selected corresponding to the purpose of printing.”) No where in Yokomizo does it suggest transmitting a packet (that includes a non-printing task) to a printing device and causing the printing device to execute the non-printing task. Therefore, Yokomizo fails to teach or suggest claim 1.

Combining Yokomizo with Rothrock fails to cure the shortcomings of Yokomizo. Rothrock only generally describes processing packets but fails to teach or suggest the recited elements of claim 1.

Since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by the references, individually or in combination, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-6 also patentably distinguish over the reference and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 14

Amended claim 14 recites identifying a non-printing task at the host computer where the non-printing task is initially configured to be executed by the host computer and is identified to be distributed to a printer for processing by the printer where the printer functions as a distributed computing device.

As described previously, Yokomizo only describes transmitting printing tasks to a printer and does not consider identifying a non-printing task to be distributed to a printer for processing by a printer as recited in claim 14. Yokomizo only teaches a system where printing tasks are processed by a printer. Since this element is not taught or suggested by Yokomizo, combining its teachings with Harif and/or Herrendoerfer fail to cure the short comings of Yokomizo.

Since claim 14 recites features not taught or suggested by the references, individually or in combination, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the references and is in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 18, 23, and 28

Applicant respectfully requests that claims 18 and 23 be reexamined in view of the amendments made and the previous discussions of Yokomizo and the other references, and to examine newly added claim 28. The references, individually or in combination, fail to teach or fairly suggest the recited elements in the respective claims. Thus, independent claims 18, 23, and 28 patentably distinguish over the references based on their recited elements and are condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-8, 14, 18-28** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

9-MAY-2005



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843